## Northern District of California

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DEMETRIC DI-AZ, et al., Plaintiffs,

v.

TESLA, INC., et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. <u>3:17-cv-06748-WHO</u>

ORDER ON PENDING MOTIONS TO SEAL

Re: Dkt. Nos. 92, 116, 118, 120, 124, 125, 131, 135, 149

In response to my December 30, 2019 Order on defendants' motion for summary judgment, the defendants in this case filed a narrowed request that I seal certain information, along with a declaration in support of that request. See Dkt. Nos. 144, 149, 152. The declaration of Athina Martinez presents compelling reasons to seal the narrowly tailored redactions, which relate to contract terms that Tesla carefully negotiates with different vendors and maintains confidential through nondisclosure agreements. See Dkt. No. 149-1. The redactions requested on page two of the chart at Dkt. No. 149 are GRANTED. Within 30 days of the date of this Order, the plaintiffs shall re-file public versions of the documents and exhibits at Dkt. No. 124 with only the redactions requested by the defendants and approved herein.<sup>1</sup>

The defendants' submission also lists docket entries they do not request to be sealed. Accordingly, the Clerk shall UNSEAL the following docket entries in their entirety: 92, 116, 118, 125, 132.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The plaintiffs should not submit chambers copies.

## Case 3:17-cv-06748-WHO Document 159 Filed 02/12/20 Page 2 of 2

United States District Court

Plaintiffs' and CitiStaff's stipulated extension of time to submit a discovery dispute is TERMINATED AS MOOT. *See* Dkt. No. 120.

## IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: February 12, 2020

